

Woodville Republican.

"THE PATH OF DUTY."

"IS THE PATH OF SAFETY."

Volume 27.

WOODVILLE, MISSISSIPPI, TUESDAY MORNING, OCTOBER 15, 1850.

Number 44.

WOODVILLE REPUBLICAN

PUBLISHED EVERY TUESDAY MORNING.

BY J. S. HOLT, JR.

Office on the North Side of the Public Square, East of the Presbyterian Church.

TERMS.

THE WOODVILLE REPUBLICAN is issued weekly at three dollars a year, if paid in advance, or four dollars, if payment be delayed until the expiration of six months.

ADVERTISEMENTS inserted at \$1.00 per square (which is ten lines) for the first insertion, and fifty cents for each continuance. The usual discount made to yearly advertisers. Where the number of insertions are not marked, they will be continued during the pleasure of the publisher, and charged accordingly.

ANNOUNCING CANDIDATES for State offices, \$10.00; for county offices, \$5.00—invariably in advance.

POETRY.



IF THOU HAST CRUSH'D A FLOWER.

BY MRS. HEMANS.

"O cast thou not Affection from thee! In this bitter world Hold to thy heart that only treasure fast: Watch—guard it—suffer not a breath to dim The bright gem's purity!"

If thou hast crush'd a flower,
The root may not be blighted;
If thou hast crush'd a lamp,
One more it may be lighted:
But on thy harp or on thy lute,
The string which thou hast broken,
Shall never in sweet sound again
Give to thy touch a token!

If thou hast loosed a bird,
Whose voice of song could cheer thee,
Still, still he may be won
From the skies to warble near thee:
But if upon the troubled sea
Thou hast thrown a gem unheeded,
Hope not that wind or wave will bring
The treasure back when needed.

If thou hast bruised a vine,
The summer's breath is healing,
And its clusters yet may glow
Through the leaves that break revealing:
But if thou hast a cup o'erthrown
With a bright draught fill'd—oh! never
Shall earth give back that lavish'd wealth
To cool thy parch'd lip's fever!

The heart is like that cup,
If thou waste the love it bore thee;
And like that jewel gone,
Which the deep will not restore thee:
And like that string of harp or lute,
Whence the sweet sound is scatter'd—
Gently, oh! gently touch the chords,
So soon for ever shatter'd.

EXTRACTS FROM A SPEECH
HON. J. M. CALHOUN, OF FLORIDA,
ON THE ADMISSION OF CALIFORNIA.

I pass now to another and a higher aspect of the question—to that aspect of it which regards its bearing upon the relative political power of the two great sections of the Union. The admission of new States addresses itself entirely to the discretion of Congress. In the exercise of this discretion, we may properly look over the whole field of Confederate policy, with a view to the general good of the Republic. Especially should we regard all those considerations which may effect the harmony and permanence of the Union. Now, Senators, I bring boldly before you the issue of relative political power, as between the slaveholding and non-slaveholding States. I am earnestly convinced that the preservation in this body of a due relative weight, as between these two great social and political divisions of the country, and that the disregard of this policy will imperil the Union.

Up to this time an equipoise in the number of slaveholding and non-slaveholding States has been nearly a practicable, and to all useful degree, preserved. The admission of California will turn the balance in favor of the non-slaveholding States, which for convenience, I will call the Northern States, under circumstances that render it probable no further or future accessions to the number of slaveholding or Southern States can be anticipated. We have, then, reached the point in our political history when we must decide if a permanent ascendancy and control in the Federal Government can be allowed to one of these sections without the danger of disturbing the beneficial and safe action of the system. This is the very grave issue that presents itself now. I will not shrink from marching up to it. No good citizens, from the North or the South, ought to shrink from it. According to the view with which the subject impresses my mind, I consider it resolves itself into an issue of Union—not by immediate effect, but in its unavoidable consequences. In this view it becomes an issue for the country—an issue involving the social and political destinies of the whole people, North and South, who are now united under this Government. The issue lies in our path. It should be met fully and firmly, with a disposition on both sides to make all just concessions for the sake of union which are consistent with the safety and honor of our respec-

tive sections. We owe this to the spirit of patriotism, and to those feelings of fraternity which brought the States into union—which cannot long exist, if the present causes of irritation are not removed—which may forever exist, if justice and kindness shall mark our intercourse as confederates.

The difference in the social organization—the domestic structure—of the Northern and Southern States is fundamental. This difference, being fundamental, enters necessarily into the internal political structure of these States, and marks, as between the sections, in their relation to each other, a distinct line of division in political interests. This difference in interest can only consist with a union in government to the degree that all legislation which can affect prejudicially the interest that divides them is forbidden, or that a power exists in the interest endangered to protect itself within the Government. The Constitution provides no direct means by which either section may, at its own will, and by an independent power, check aggression, and defend itself from assault. For a reason which I shall hereafter show, the occasion for such a check not being apparent when the union was formed, it was not provided for. Upon the forbearance of antagonistic interests it is idle to rely. The omission in the Constitution can only be supplied by a policy in the Government which may preserve such balance in the relative power of the two interests as will enable each to protect itself.

To produce a perfect check or counterpoise—an effective balance—by means to which a legislative policy is competent, each section should have control of one of the legislative branches; and as the North is in ascendancy in the popular branch, the South should be allowed a preponderance in this body. This, if practicable, would be one of the means by which it seems to me, the harmony and union of the States might be assured, and made perpetual. The power in Congress to admit new States at discretion makes it practicable. Hitherto, however, a sufficient balance, and the defensive power resulting from it, has been found in the same fact which satisfied those interests originally in forming their union—namely, that the number of States represented in this body was equally divided, as near as could be, between the two interests. True that, from time to time, either interest may have found itself in possession, for a while, of a superior number; but this was rendered immaterial, because, whenever that was the case, it was well understood that a balancing State was in progress of formation, soon to restore the equality. Whether in the progressive fierceness which seems to mark the antagonism of the sections, anything that is competent to the legislative power, short of the surrender of one branch to each section, will give such assurance of safety from assault as will preserve harmony and union between them, is problematical. But thus far an equality of representation in this body has been deemed sufficient, and has answered to a certain extent, though not in perfect degree the purpose of a practical check in the power of the two sections. The admission of California, in view of existing facts connected with the political and territorial history of the country of late years, confers upon the North a majority in the Senate, without any probability that a balancing Southern State can ever be admitted. Can the Southern section of States assent to this? Ought they to assent? Can they or ought they to permit it? Believing that no people can wisely permit their destinies to pass out of their own independent control, and that least of all can the slaveholding States allow their destinies and existence to pass under the control of a hostile interest and antagonistic power, I answer boldly and distinctly, as one of the representatives of the Southern section, that we ought not and cannot.

While the increase of power in the Senate is not necessary to the North, it is vital to the South. In the first place the North is in undisputed and unchangeable possession of the House of Representatives. Her power of defence is therefore perfect. The South has no such element of power in the Government. In the next place, the South has had an interest much more sensitive than any which distinguishes the northern section, and a legislative war upon which would be attended with more fatal and wide spread calamities than would follow from any assault to which the North is open. A defensive power, therefore, is more essential to us than to them. But it may be said that because the political balance in the Senate is lost, all is not lost—that the Executive and Judicial departments are competent, by the veto of the one and the judicial intervention of the other, to prevent unconstitutional legislation to our prejudice. I reply to this, that no effectual security can be found in the Executive or Judicial departments, after the Legislative department shall have passed into northern control. To the same extent to which the North is in the ascendancy in the two branches of Congress will it be in the ascendancy in the Electoral College. With the power to make a President in defiance of southern opposition, the North may effectually reduce to her control the Executive department. With a northern Executive to nominate Judges, and a northern Senate to confirm, how long would it be before the Supreme Bench might be filled with judges imbued with northern sentiments and bias, and instrumental to northern purposes of aggression? That the Executive and Judicial departments may be subverted to the will of a dominant section, and made to minister to its purposes, does not involve an imputation of corruption in those departments. Both departments may all the while be filled by men of very honest intentions. But do we not all know

that upon every possible issue of constitutional construction, there are different opinions among the ablest and best men of either section? Have we not seen a Judge of the Supreme Court abandon a proper judicial reserve, to convey to the northern public his opinion that the Wilmot proviso was constitutional? Is there not now an Executive who holds that opinion? Are we sure that in the Executive department, even now, there are none who believe that Congress has power to prohibit the interstate slave trade, and to abolish slavery in the forts and arsenals, and in the District of Columbia? Can it be doubted that statesmen will be found to fill the Executive chair, and eminent jurists to occupy the Judicial bench, who will honestly concern in the same views of the constitution which the North from time to time may hold, and under sanction of which they may seek to reach our domestic organization with hostile legislation? There is no shield, then, for our rights in the Executive or Judicial departments, when the full control of the Legislative department shall have settled down in the North. When that time comes, the whole unchecked power of the Government will be consolidated in the North, and the South will hold her existence at the mercy of that dominant power. Nor can we rely upon a sense of justice to restrain northern aggression so far as the slaveholding interest is concerned. There will be two of the most powerful motives of human action impelling them onward to assault us—lust of power and fanaticism. These two influences combining to the same end, will drive the popular mind of the North, unrestrained as it will be by any resisting force in the Government, to a unity and determination of purpose which no public man will be able to stand up against. What do we see already? In the very anticipation of power, so strongly does the current set in opposition to the just rights of the Southern States, that upon every issue affecting the slaveholding interest, the northern representatives are consolidated without distinction of party, against us in their votes. A few noble individual instances to the contrary may and do exist. But will we honor the few who stand out in bold relief from this unholy crusade, can we blind ourselves to the fact that they are acting in sacrifice of themselves, and that the next wave of the popular madness may sweep them from the council hall which their presence adorns? I repeat, then, in all frankness, can we trust our rights upon a confidence in the justice of the North? Can the North trust itself? Ought we, when our very existence is staked upon the issue, to trust to a power which every inducement of sectional and political advantage, of social prejudice, and of religious zeal, will stimulate to legislative war upon the largest property interest of the South? Ought they, when they know the Union must fall under the first net of open assault, to desire to be trusted with this power? Does our experience of the influence which the ordinary human motives and passions exert in the operations of Government justify such confidence? Sir, while in respect to this question we ask to be delivered from evil, they should as sedulously desire to avoid being led into temptation.

But does our experience of the past justify us in relying upon a stern faith in the North? The South has made three leading Compacts of Compromise with the North in the course of the history of their Union. The first was in the convention. We bought for a price the obligation on the part of the North to restore our fugitives from labor. Have they kept faith in that? So far from seeking compliance with their engagement, public opinion is arrayed openly against the duty. Legislatures pass laws obstructing the operation of the constitution, and societies are permitted openly to exist public boast is made of the number of instances in which they have helped to violate the stipulation. Sir, a notable admission was that which one of the greatest statesmen of the North (Mr. Webster) made upon this floor, in a late discussion—an admission the record of which should be engraved upon a tablet of brass, as a lasting proof against northern faith. Did you not all hear him admit that not an instance had occurred in Massachusetts of a successful attempt in the recapture of a slave, nor had an instance occurred of a false claim for one?

The next great Compact of Compromise was the Missouri Compromise. The South yielded there, for peace, to the establishment of a line of division to the Pacific ocean between the two interests. The North has taken all the benefits—has appropriated all the territory north of it to the Pacific; and now, does she yield us the benefit we paid the price for, on the south of the line?

The last instance was the tariff compromise. She used the fruit of it until the term of limitation was exhausted; and as soon as our turn came to enjoy the benefit, another law of protective tax was passed, more abominable than the bill of abominations which they had surrendered upon compromise. Ah, yes, sir; bear in mind all the early evidences of anti-slavery feeling in the North, before and in the Federal convention—the utter disregard of the constitutional provision for the surrender of slaves—the extensive public organizations in the Northern States for the avowed object of war upon this feature in the internal social structure of the South—the unfriendly and even discourteous spirit of the resolutions which come from the Northern States to this body—the general compactness of the adversary northern vote in both Houses upon all questions that involve the security of the slave interest or the extension of the slaveholding States—and tell me if there are not reasons to check our confidence? Has not almost

every Northern State, in some form or other, declared against the admission of any more slave States? Is there a northern statesman who can venture to rise now, here, this day, and say that he believes that his constituents will favor the accession of another slave State to the Union? Can we, then, agree now to surrender the whole power of government to the North, by the passage of this bill, with the knowledge that in doing so the doom of our subjection in the Union becomes irrevocable?

The Senator from Pennsylvania, (Mr. Cooper,) who supported the late compromise bill, in an elaborate argument in its favor, frankly stated the advantage it gave the North. In what he said lay the whole philosophy of the question. What mattered it whether the Wilmot proviso, or anything else which the North wanted, was contained in the bill? The bill gave them the control of the Legislative department. That secured, all else would follow. That was the prize he and the other northern friends of the bill sagaciously strove for. The admission of California; that accomplished, in any way most easy to be done, all else would follow, at the pleasure of the North. But I was referring to him to quote his words as an admonition to the South, coming from the frank lips of a northern Senator. He declared, as the advantage he looked to from the bill, that by the admission of California they secured "A FUNDAMENTAL OF THE FREE STATES in this body, and the ability, if true to themselves, TO PREVENT THE FURTHER ACQUISITION OF SLAVE TERRITORY, OR THE EXTENSION OF SLAVERY BEYOND ITS GUARANTEED LIMITS."

But why should the North thus directly seek to secure an ascendancy in the Government, and to prevent the extension of slave territory, and the growth and accession of new slave States? There are only two possible motives which can govern her in her purpose: either to reach slavery in the States by the indirect method of penning it up within fixed limits, or to aggrandize their own political power by securing a settled ascendancy in all the departments of the Government. It is not to promote the comfort of the black race—for their comfort would be best promoted by dispersion. It is not to diminish the multiplication of slaves, because their numbers are only added to by natural increase, which will still go on. The purpose, then, is either fanatical or political—to destroy property as it exists in the Southern States, or to destroy the political weight of the South in the Union; in other words, to emancipate our slaves as a property, or subordinate our States as a section. Whichever of these be the object, we cannot submit; for either of them must be fatal to us.

The spirit of the North in her present purpose must be also aggressive and not defensive. She has a fixed and unalterable majority in the House of Representatives, and in the Electoral College, and the control of the Senate is therefore unnecessary to her defence. And if aggressive, to what point do her aggressive designs tend? Plainly, to the attack of slave property; for it is that which chiefly divides the interests and sympathies of the two sections, and that is the only interest which is peculiar to us as a section.

In every aspect in which I can consider the matter, I feel nerved to the issue, and inspired to the duty of contending to the last extremity for the preservation of the political balance of the two sections in this Union. I conscientiously believe that when that is gone, nothing short of a convention of the States for the reformation of the compact of Union can preserve the harmony of the States. Here, then, I plant myself; and until a provision is conceded, under the effect of which the South may have assurance of being able to add a counterbalancing State to the Union, I can never consent to the admission of a Northern State. This concession is sought in the last clause of the substitute I have offered, which proposes a Territorial Government south of the parallel of 36 degrees 30 minutes on the Pacific coast, with an express provision for the security of slave property.

This principle of an equality, or balance of the two sections in this body, is no new idea, as has been lately pretended. It is an idea as old as the Union, and is commended by a settled practice, beginning with the first years of the Republic and extended to the present time.

I will not say that the adjustment of power, in the convention which formed the constitution, had direct reference to an equilibrium between the slaveholding and non-slaveholding States. It so happened that by the order of Providence this equilibrium in fact existed as nearly as possible, and, as the probability of any serious disturbance of it seems not to have been apprehended, it was not made a point. The free and slave States were equal as nearly as an odd number would admit. The North had the odd number, and this gave her a slight present preponderance; but the South had the best founded expectations of growth, and there was, therefore, no occasion for alarm. This existing and admitted equilibrium and balance is distinctly adverted to in a letter of Mr. Madison to Mr. Edmund Randolph, upon the subject of the proposed new organization, a month before the convention assembled. It will be found published in the volumes of the Madison papers. In discussing the prospect of inducing the States to make their Union more intimate in its character, and the Federal Government more supreme, by a change in the principle of representation, which should regard the relative population of the States, instead of their equality as sovereigns, he says:

"The Northern States will be recompensed to it by the actual superiority of their pop-

ulation; the southern by their expected superiority on this point."

This extract establishes, upon the authority of Mr. Madison, that the distinction between Northern and Southern States—the Northern and Southern section—North and South power—Northern and Southern policy—were ideas which, at that day, and prior to the constitution, had lodgment in the minds and hearts of the men of America; and it further establishes, that although the North then had a slight and unavoidable superiority, the South expected to outgrow it. It is upon this near balance that Mr. Madison founded his expectation of an agreement to discard the plan of a confederation, and to substitute a more intimate union, by infusing a popular basis in the federal representation. It is evident he counted upon the near balance of northern power and southern power to dissipate any fear for the peculiar interests of their respective sections on the part of the North or the South. It was this existing equilibrium which favored the Union, which secured the Union, and which made unnecessary the distinct discussion of a balance of power as between these sections. But the watchfulness of both sections before the constitution, and ever since, in respect to this very consideration of political power as between the North and the South—the slaveholding and non-slaveholding interest—is demonstrable by distinct and well-sustained facts. I will agree that the very purpose of political power was not openly declared by either section in the first stages of our history. But when we contemplate the several occasions of sectional division and struggle, it must be clear to every candid mind that the motive, the impulse, the consideration which guided either section, and gave the impetus to their effort, was the idea of the relative political power of the sections.

The signal instance to which I will refer of a struggle between the two sections, prior to the constitution, was in respect to the navigation of the Mississippi river in the Congress of the confederation. That struggle commenced in 1785. It was a strictly sectional struggle, was protracted to the very close of the confederation, and then transferred to the new government. It was proposed by Mr. Jay, in a negotiation with the *Encargado de Negocios* from Spain, to relinquish to that Government the exclusive use of the Mississippi river for thirty years. This he urged strongly upon the favor of the Congress. The Northern States unanimously pressed it—the Southern States as unitedly resisted. In the course of the struggle that ensued, very frequent votes were taken; in all of which the Northern States carried the day. Any person sending \$5 in advance, subscription for 1850 and '51, will be entitled to any four of the above engravings.

More and most liberal Offers.
For \$20 in advance, ten copies of the Lady's Book will be sent, and a copy of either of the above magnificent prints sent to each subscriber, and an extra copy of the "Book" and an engraving to the person sending the club. They can, in all cases, select which they please.
That all the vacant western lands were slave territory. Whoever will trace the history of that conflict, and will examine the testimony of Mr. Pickney, of South Carolina, who was the leader on the part of the South, will be convinced that it was a sectional struggle for political power between the North and the South.

A NEW CEMENT.

The Montgomery Advertiser contains the following notice of the new and valuable cement discovered and prepared by Mr. REMINGTON, of Bridge notoriety. If the Advertiser is not deceived as to its properties, it will prove a most valuable discovery:

REMINGTON CEMENT.—We witnessed, a few days since, some very extraordinary results from a few of the most simple and cheap ingredients—the most important being common sand. We saw them mixed before our eyes in two or three minutes, and spread, or rather poured upon the roof of a house, where in a few hours, it became hard—so perfectly so, in a couple of days, it could be with great difficulty broken even with the severest blow of an axe. We suppose it would not be doing justice to the inventor or discoverer to mention the ingredients, but we may say that they are of cheap, easily abundant, in almost every locality throughout the United States, and the process of *rationne* so perfectly simple, that a child could make the mixture, it requiring not the least skill. It is perfectly impervious to water, slightly elastic, and a nonconductor of electricity—three qualities or properties which render it peculiarly fitted to the objects for which it was intended by the inventor or discoverer, viz: the covering of houses, fences, &c.

Mr. Remington thinks its durability equal to that of granite. It is certainly quite as difficult to separate after being exposed two or three days to the air, as we ourselves have seen tried, by the blows of an axe. The covering for houses will be less expensive than that of wood, and its use for fences will, perhaps, be but slightly more so. One or two houses have already been covered with it in our city, and others have been contracted for. As to cohesive and adhesive qualities, and its imperviousness to water, and its cheapness, there can be no doubt; and if its durability is as great as is claimed for it by the inventor, then it is one of the most important and useful discoveries of the age.

The Governor of Alabama has been requested, by a number of citizens in and about Cahaba, to convene the Legislature, with a view of calling a convention of the people to consider some mode of redress for the late federal outrages upon the South. Let the people be heard.—Yazoo Democrat.

A LETTER FROM THE FREE TRADER.

LOWER HOMERIDGE, Oct. 2, 1850.
MAJOR EDWARD—Dear Sir: My attention has been drawn to the fact that my name appears on the list published in the Natchez Courier of the 17th ultimo, of those by whom a meeting was called for the 23d ultimo, in opposition to the platform of the Nashville Convention, and in favor of sustaining Hon. H. S. Foote and Mr. Clay's Omnibus Bill.

My name was appended by the call, without my consent or authority, by a youth who appears to be drumming for the Federalist and Submissionists. I am a Democrat of the Southern school, and cannot be reconciled to the appearance of my name to a call approving a system of measure by which the slaveholding States have been openly robbed of their just rights; and, least of all, could I be induced to appropriate the course of Senator Foote, who has violated the known will of his constituents, turned traitor to the State of Mississippi, and, in my humble opinion, is less entitled to approval than was Benedict Arnold, inasmuch as Arnold, in the early part of his career, rendered some valuable services to the colonies, while the Senator only acted the bully during the brief period of his advocacy of Southern rights, without, in the smallest degree, advancing our interest, or rendering us the least service of value. I am an humble citizen, and felt disposed to pass unnoticed and uncorrected the use of my name; to me it makes small difference whether it appears in the list or not; but I have sons, born and to be, I hope, raised, as I have been, in the South. That they may not hereafter blush for their father when taunted with the charge that his name appeared among those who seem to be willing tamely to submit to the degradation of their section from the proud position of political equality to that of slavish inferiority—to blot out from the star-spangled banner the Southern galaxy, leaving for their posterity the stripes only—to dismember a slaveholding State, thus pandering to free-soilism and stock-jobbing—and who reward a treacherous Senator by fulsome laudation—I respectfully request that you place on record, among the files of the Free Trader, this my emphatic disclaimer of any connection with Federalism, Free-soilism, or submissionism. Truly yours,
M. M. LOVE.

GEN. CHAPLIN THE SLAVE STEALER.—A writ of habeas corpus was issued on the 18th inst., by his honor, Judge Cranch, Chief Justice of the Circuit Court for the District of Columbia, on the application of the counsel of this person and on the 19th instant he was brought before Judge C., who required bail of \$6,000 for his appearance at the fall term of the Criminal Court. A bond for the requisite amount of bail being entered into, jointly and severally, by Gen. Chaplin, David A. Hall, Selby Parker and Wm. Blanchard, the first named was discharged from the custody of the jailor of Washington county, but held upon a warrant issued by virtue of the requisition of the Governor of Maryland, in compliance with which he was in the afternoon conveyed to Rockville by officers Goddard and Hardy.

SLANG EPIPHETS.—We see some of the democratic press are speaking of President Fillmore as *His Accidenty*. True, the whigs used to bestow the same contemptuous epithet on Mr. Tyler, when he became president by a similar casualty.

But this departure from decency and propriety on their part, is no warrant for the democratic press to pursue a similar course towards the present incumbent.

Mr. Fillmore is president of the United States by the provisions of our fundamental organic law, the constitution, and however much we may differ from him politically, he is as much the president as if he had been elected to that position in the first place, instead of being elevated by the accidental death of General Taylor. He is emphatically the president, the bestowal of the slang epithet of *His Accidenty*, ought to be confined to the "decency party" that first originated it.
[Madisonian.]

A witness was examined in one of the courts of Illinois, upon a trial concerning a horse trade, was asked by the counsel of the defendant how the plaintiff generally rode.
"He generally rides a straddle, sir."
"How does he ride in company?"
"If he has a good horse he always keeps up."
"How does he ride when he is alone?"
"Really, I cannot say, for I never was in company with him when he rode by himself."
"You may stand aside, sir."